



(“Fiat Justitia Ruat Cælum.”)

THE STORY
OF
MY CONNECTION
WITH THE
CHINIQUY MOVEMENT IN MONTREAL,
OF 1874-77;
OR
A PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ASSEMBLY REPORT
CRITICISED.

DEPOSED
BY THE
SABBATH SCHOOL

BY (WILLIAM B.) COURT,

(Ex-Superintendent of St. John's French Presbyterian Sabbath School,

*Translator of "Catéchisme Protestant," "Premier Catéchisme,"
and Author of Pamphlet on "La Convention
Chrétienne de Messrs. Moody et
Sankey, tenue à New York."*)

LETTERS FROM READERS.

REV. MR. CHINIQUEY AND HIS WORK.

SIR,—The following letter from a convert from Romanism will no doubt be read with interest :—

MONTEBELLO, P.Q., Oct. 7, 1877.

REV. MR. CHINIQUEY :

MY DEAR SIR,—You are not probably aware that I owe you \$10 a year. But it is the fact, for on the 7th of February, 1876, I promised to God never to smoke any more. I was a great smoker, and used to expend every year \$10 in tobacco, and turn them into smoke. It seemed to me that so much money for such a gratification was an insult to the great God who has saved me. I then made a vow to give that sum to the Rev. Mr. Chiniquy, or any other who is preaching the Gospel of Christ to our people, that they may know that they have a Saviour in Jesus Christ crucified. These ten dollars are a very small offering indeed, but it is given with a grateful heart.

I am, your affectionate brother in Christ,
JOSEPH SIGARD.

Now, will you not acknowledge that the sentiments of that convert are admirable? But do not believe that this is an exceptional case. I know many who have made still greater sacrifices with the same noble sentiments. Not long ago a butcher who used to live well with his trade, went to several places to buy his cattle, but his conversion had been known; not only the people would not sell him anything, but they hunted him as a wild beast, and even threatened to throw him into the river. He is now a ruined man, but does he regret the loss of his friends, his trade and his position? No, after having counted his losses and told me his ruin, he added: "I know for whom I suffer all these things. I thank God that I have been found worthy to suffer for my dear Saviour's sake. My trust is in Him; He will look down in His mercy upon me and my poor family." After this, he knelt down with me, and in a fervent prayer, he asked his Heavenly Father, through Christ, to strengthen him in this hour of trial. That man will have to exile himself very soon, or starve here, in our midst, as the greatest part of those who have given up the errors of Rome before him have been forced to do, by the negligence of the Protestants; for the Protestants who are so wise and intelligent in so many things, seem to be perfectly blind in their duties towards the converts. Of the 1,150 families which have given up Romanism these last three years, more than 600 have been obliged to leave the country; for the very day after their conversion, it is next to impossible to find any work among their former co-religionists, and, with very few exceptions, the English-speaking Protestants close their doors against them and harden their hearts in order not to be moved by their terrible sufferings. I do not exaggerate when I say that it is the fault of the Protestants if Montreal is still in the hands of the priests. Perhaps the Protestants of Montreal will not like to hear that from me; but it is quite time they should know their guilt in this grave matter, and I consider it a conscientious duty on my part to tell them the truth, though it may be unpalatable.

If all the converts from Popery who have accepted the truth in the college of "La Pointe aux Trembles" had been kept in Montreal by a reasonable protection, and if all the converts by Messrs. Lapeltrie, Coté, Roussy, Courcy, Cyr, Marie, Van-Buren, Tanner, Bernon, Riendeau, Cellier, Dondiet, Vernier, Vaisseau, Amaron, &c., &c., had been honorably taken by the hand and induced to remain by the assurance of being employed, and encouraged by the Protestant business men of Montreal, they would have been numerous enough to break, to-day, at the ballot box, the iron yoke of the priests.

The Jesuits and the Clergy of Rome under-

lance, which will sweep them away as the dry straw is swept by the storm. They will then see their want of wisdom, but it will be too late.

I know that some of these converts have proved, just as in apostolic times, traitors and unfaithful; they have continued to be true Roman Catholics when they pretended to be Protestants; I have now 400 on my list of these people. But, by the grace of God, the immense majority of the converts were worthy of our confidence, and it is a most deplorable thing, it is a real public calamity, that they have been obliged to exile themselves and leave the city, for want of a protection which could have been so easily given them.

When I say that there are too many Protestants who seem to ignore that element of strength which God presents to them in the converts, I am happy to acknowledge that there are several who do all they can to protect them and induce them to remain by all the means which God has put into their hands. Several times we have been enabled to dry the tears of those newborn children of the Gospel, through the good Samaritans. With the timely and providential help we have been enabled to present to some who were to leave the city, we have been enabled to keep them here, and we cannot sufficiently thank and bless those noble-hearted and intelligent brethren and sisters. But it is only when this Christian disposition becomes more general in Montreal that this remarkable and so blessed religious movement will tell on the Church of Rome; for it is only then that the number of converts and their influence will be understood and felt everywhere. May our great and merciful God grant that this day may soon come, for then alone the walls of Babylon will fall, and our dear Canadian countrymen will come to the Lamb who will make them free with His Word and pure with His blood.

Truly Yours,

C. CHINIQUEY.

Montreal, Oct., 1877.

The above letter from Mr. Chiniquy well merits consideration at the hands of Protestants. The Ladies' French Evangelization Society of the Presbyterian Church is endeavoring by the personal efforts of its members and by advertisements in our columns to procure employment for many of the converts, and that we believe with some measure of success. From an appeal just issued by the Board of French Evangelization, the Board under whose auspices Mr. Chiniquy labors, we learn that \$33,500 are required to carry on their work this year, and that at present they are urgently in need of money. The following extract we take from the appeal: "The salaries of the missionaries, with two or three exceptions, are payable monthly. Of these the 'are now due about \$1,700, and the Board's recent meeting felt constrained to pass a resolution instructing the Secretary to notify the missionaries that unless funds were forthcoming, they could not pay the salaries monthly as in the past. Dependent for support on the funds of the Board, as most of the missionaries almost entirely are, they will feel this as a very great hardship, the more so that many of them are at great expense at this season of the year in the payment of rent, and in laying in winter supplies of provisions. The Board hope that the mere statement of this fact will suffice to draw out the liberality of the congregations of the Church, and of the friends of the work. The Board continue to be greatly encouraged by the success of the work. Amid much opposition and many difficulties, the cause of French Evangelization by God's blessing, is making rapid strides. While money is urgently needed for the execution of the work, still more urgent is

PREFATORY REMARKS.

Two or three remarks, by way of preface, may not be out of place.

I would like specially to call attention to the fact, very plainly stated in the body of my work, that before taking the somewhat extreme and unusual, but in my opinion justifiable, course of exposing to public criticism the truth in reference to the administration in Montreal of the French Presbyterian Mission, I made every effort to secure a more righteous management, by having recourse to the regular Church Courts of my denomination. I may add, however, that I did not formulate any regular charge against the gentlemen whose acts I am criticising before these Courts in the official way, for the best of reasons, viz., the conviction I had of the hopelessness of obtaining justice for myself in as far as the matter in question is concerned.

And it should be remembered that there was a promise made by Principal McVicar, in the *Montreal Gazette*, to allow an impartial and public inquiry to be made by the Presbyterian General Assembly into my accusations. Why was not this inquiry instituted by that Court? Not a word was said on the subject at the last meeting of Assembly.

I may say, further, that this pamphlet does not contain by any means all that I intended to publish concerning the operations of the French Board. Anyone, however, who desires fuller information, has only to make an impartial examination of the French Mission in this City to find out the truth of my accusations and of others that I might mention a hundred times more serious. Let the French missionaries in Montreal, well known for their good character, be consulted, and these statements, I do not fear, will be confirmed.

I perhaps need not say that I shall not refer to private transgressions, but only to public sins, to a faulty administrative policy, to transgressions of the well-recognized laws of the Presbyterian Church itself, to arbitrariness and injustice, the result of an extreme party spirit, and all these public transgressions still persisted in, and being in fact the well-recognized policy and essential to the success of the methods employed by those whose actions I am criticising.

I desire to apologize for any repetitions of facts which may be found. A careful examination of my little work will show that they are unavoidable.

that they would have been numerous enough to break, to-day, at the ballot box, the iron yoke of the priests.

The Jesuits and the Clergy of Rome understand this truth very well. Hence, their superhuman and too successful efforts to make it almost impossible for a convert to have any employment among his former co-religionists. Almost every day I have to give letters of recommendation to some of our dear converts, who having lost their positions on account of their conversion, and being rebuked by the English-speaking people, who prefer to encourage the Roman Catholics than their own co-religionists, are forced to cross the lines, where they find a protection which is refused here.

So long as this suicidal and anti-Christian policy is followed by the English Protestants of Montreal, they must not complain if the Roman Catholics treat them with the utmost contempt. Let them not complain if their hands are tied and paralyzed by the municipal laws and regulations of the priests' blind slaves. They deserve their fate for they come not "to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

Let the Protestants of Montreal understand to-day that one of their most sacred duties is to give a helping hand to those who renounce the errors of Popery, by giving them some work to support their families, and to-morrow thousands of French-Canadians will break the yoke of the priest. Every day I meet some of them who are completely disgusted with the ridiculous superstitions and mummeries of their church. They know that the auricular confession is a school of immorality, where their wives and daughters are scandalized. They understand that their "wafer god" is a monstrous piece of idolatry, that purgatory is a swindling business, but when I press them to come out from that Church they show me their wives and children, who will starve the very next day if they follow my advice and obey the voice of their intelligence.

It is with the utmost difficulty that our converts can find houses to rent. If they have any little debts they are prosecuted without mercy. How many times I have entered the houses of Roman Catholic enquirers, where I was happy to see all the marks of comfort, but when I visited the same houses six months after I had received their abjuration from Popery, my heart was broken by the signs of the most distressing misery. The poor converted family had sold everything piece after piece, at almost a nominal price, rather than ask any help to prevent their children from starving to death. How many times I almost regretted to have been the innocent cause of such terrible sufferings by giving them the Gospel. When I had something in hand, as the ten dollars of our dear Brother Sicard, I could dry the tears and give bread to the hungry; but when, as is too often the case, I have only my tears to give to those dear new-born children of the Gospel, I say it plainly, I many times regretted to have ever set my feet in Montreal.

What a strange Christianity is the Christianity of several of our wealthy Protestants of Montreal, when they do not see that their first, their most sacred duty, is to do all in their power, with the help of God, to break the power of Popery, by forming strong and numerous churches of converts in their midst? If those who have le-

sculties, the cause of French Evangelization, "by God's blessing, is making rapid strides. While money is urgently needed for the prosecution of the work, still more urgent is the need of earnest, believing prayer on the part of God's people, that the seed being sown may yield an abundant harvest. Contributions to be forwarded to the Treasurer, addressed Rev. R. H. Warden, 210 St. James street, Montreal, "real."

I cheerfully admit the profound knowledge of theological science, the undoubted shrewdness, the well known perseverance, the inimitable attachment to the principles of Presbyterianism, along with many other good qualities of my opponents. I say this at the outset, so that my motives may not be misunderstood.

If I have chosen a publication Society as a means of giving to the public the following facts, I should not, I think, be any more responsible for the private or corporate views of the gentlemen composing that Society, than I should be for those of any private publishing firm to which I should dispose of my M.S.

Heaven knows that I do not advance my personal comfort or interests by making these revelations. While I shall gain friends and sympathizers, I know I shall lose many that I already have, and shall besides make a host of enemies and traducers. I am, however, daring to do right in this, as I hope I am trying to do in all things.

MONTREAL, August 1877.

W. B. C.

THE STORY OF MY CONNECTION
WITH THE
CHINIQUEY MOVEMENT IN MONTREAL
OF 1874-77;
OR
A PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ASSEMBLY REPORT
CRITICISED.

I honestly confess that I write more in sorrow than in anger. Although the gentlemen, or some of them, whose unrighteous acts I expose to the criticism of public opinion, have done me great wrong, and were the means of disappointing some of my most fondly cherished hopes, yet I say that I have no personal ill will against them. I forgive and pity the men. I cannot, however, palliate their acts, and hasten now to reveal some of them to public judgment, to be followed, I am sure, by public condemnation.

I first became connected with the French mission work of the Presbyterian Church in the fall of 1874, when Rev. Charles Tanner, then pastor of St. John's French Presbyterian Church, invited me to become a teacher in his Sunday School.

I need not give here an account of my personal experience of the administration of the French Evangelization Board of my Church, or rather of the Chairman and his faithful *Achates* (*) for the time being (for I do not by any means, when using the expression "French Board" in this little work, include all the members thereof. There are gentlemen on it who have expressed to me again and again their disapproval of the measures adopted by the Chairman.) I do not wish moreover to intrude in this part of my work my own special troubles

(*) Prof. Campbell acted as *Achates* for some time, and now Rev. R. H. Warden, Secretary of the Board, fills that honorable position.

upon the public, further than to say that on two occasions, by the employment of unjust measures on the part of the gentlemen referred to, I was obliged to sever my connection with the Sunday School.

My personal experience clearly proved to me that this scheme of the Presbyterian Church was managed by these gentlemen in an unchristian, unpresbyterian and arbitrary spirit.

While undoubted energy, and especially on the part of Prof. Campbell, unselfishness were displayed, yet the general policy was calculated to destroy a very promising movement towards Protestantism.

I wish to speak first of my connection with M. LeMétayer-Masselin, Baron de Guichainville.

This gentleman called upon me in the fall of 1875. I found him an exceedingly intelligent, well-read man. His story of failure in business both in France and Canada, and other facts, the veracity of which he supported by documents &c., appeared to me to bear the marks of candor and truth. He appeared to be intellectually convinced of the errors of Rome.

My policy with regard to him, and my advice to the Mission Board, if by any contingency it had been asked, a contingency not very likely to have happened, would have been to have kept him in obscurity for at least some months, and then after a course of study of Protestantism and especially of the essential truths of the Gospel, to have brought him forward for active public usefulness in connection with the French Mission. This policy, it appears to me, would have been the wisest to adopt. What, however, was that of our clerical administrators? M. LeMétayer's resignation was published—a very questionable step in the case of any convert. He was elected Secretary of the Board of Management of the Church, *although he never joined the Church by profession of faith*. In fact, being a gentleman of superior

administrative ability, he was placed second in command in St. John's Church,—Col. Campbell being in command, of course under the strict supervision of Gen. McVicar.

This bringing forward so suddenly of M. de Guichainville was never desired by the latter. He did all he could to prevent it ; but the remarkable persistence of Vicar-General (to change the figure) Campbell, aided by the equally astonishing perseverance of Bishop McVicar, for which traits in their characters I give them full credit, overcame his scruples.

The intimate relations of M. LeMétayer-Masselin with the gentlemen of the Presbyterian Board were sustained till the spring of 1876, when difficulties arose between him and Prof. Campbell. These difficulties culminated in the secession of M. LeMétayer from St. John's Church, and in his expulsion a short time after for "scandalous conduct." Of this act I have to say a word. Of what crimes was M. de Guichainville guilty that this extreme course was adopted ? Is not this form of discipline exercised in the Presbyterian Church only in cases of habitual open drunkenness or immorality ? Was the French Baron ever chargeable with such acts ? No, certainly not. His crimes were a truly noble independence, *an earnest desire to carry on the work of St. John's Church in an honest, straightforward, evangelical way.* This act of expulsion, decided upon at a meeting of the Board of Management of the Church, was confirmed at a congregational business meeting held after the ordinary Thursday evening religious service. *But no previous notice was given to the congregation of the proposed meeting or of its special character.* The meeting was very sparsely attended.

I may say here, *en passant*, that M. LeMétayer never, as far as I can remember, requested me to make this public statement of the management (in as far as it concerns himself) by the French Board, or at least by the Chairman and his faithful *Achates*, of the sacred trust confided to them.

I now come to the case of the French Protestant Benevolent Society, which was founded in January 1876, by members of the different denominations represented in the Montreal French Mission field. Of course the bulk of persons assisted was composed of Father Chiniquy's converts, but the name of the Society, as found in its books and as decided upon at the meeting of all French speaking Protestants in the City, was that of "*Société de Bienfaisance des Protestants Canadiens Français et autres Nationalités parlant la langue Française dans la Cité de Montréal.*" (Benevolent Society of French Canadian Protestants and other French speaking Nationalities in the City of Montreal.) M. LeMétayer became its first President.

A document which follows hereafter, contains my accusations against the Board, on account of its interference in the management of the Society. What had our Presbyterian Church directly to do with the affairs of a non-sectarian Association, drawing funds from all denominations? Yet the gentlemen of the French Board actually imposed upon the Society's Committee a Treasurer, whom they employed to get information from them; and when they found that the independent members would not work under this system, they showed their true colors, and interfered actively in the direction of the Society, by Mr. Campbell publishing a report of its operations for the winter—which publication, containing many inaccuracies, led to correspondence in the *Witness*, by M. LeMétayer, which finally resulted in the prosecution for libel, directed by the latter against the Treasurer above referred to.

As one object of this statement of facts is to criticise the contents of the Report of the French Board, submitted to the General Assembly in June 1876, I would now refer to a statement made in that report—(See Acts and Proceedings of Second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Toronto : Presbyterian Printing House. Page 179)—

we find there that 2043 converts were gathered in by M. Chiniquy, from June 29th, 1875 to May 1876. It is further stated that "nearly two hundred imposters have been detected and dealt with," and "that the Priests, with all their vigilance and peculiar means of securing recantations, have not been able to strike off a single name from the list of those we have retained."

The facts of the case are these, and they have been obtained by the writer himself, from the *only reliable source of information*, viz., the books of the Society, now in the hands of its President, M. LeMétayer-Masselin, and which books our pious administrators have tried, by all means, such as lawyers' letters, &c., to get into their possession, but unsuccessfully; and it should be noticed that these gentlemen prepared their report to the Assembly without consulting these books—yet there is no mention of that fact in the report.

About 554 names of *heads of families* (this must be clearly understood, not names of *persons*) were registered in these books. Many of these individuals had children, and some of them gave to M. Chiniquy two, three, or four names of children, as the case may have been. These children's names were published by M. Chiniquy, with the names of the parents; and thus the 2000 names mentioned in the report of the Board are correct. But notice. Many names were of Protestants of long date—perhaps thirty heads of families. And many parents gave the names of their sons, in some cases three or four, *as heads of families*, and thus received aid from M. Chiniquy, and from the Society, in the names of their children. The parents, in many such cases, did not give their own names, and thus they themselves remained Roman Catholics, and received aid from both Protestant and Catholic charitable institutions.

In the *Witness* of 3rd April, 1876, M. LeMétayer-Masselin stated that 250 names had been erased from the books

of the Society, so that 300 names remain, making about 1200 converts (giving four children to each family.) But the names of old Protestants should have been deducted, in the report of the Board, from the imposters I have spoken of, in addition to the 250. And besides the 250 expelled for prostitution, concubinage, drunkenness, false addresses, false names, &c., &c., the Society's Committee was on the point (when, as already mentioned, the Board stepped in and assumed the management of a non-sectarian association) of expelling about 100 more names of heads of families.

The very great majority of the French Canadians have returned to Romanism, while nearly all the French Europeans, nominally attached to Protestantism, remain where they were spiritually all along, viz., in indifference ; I say, spiritually—for I am glad to recognize that many are morally correct in their lives.

And neither the administration of Dr. McVicar or his friends, nor the controversial sermons of M. Chiniquy, will bring them out of that state. It is only the Spirit of God, working through the faithful preaching and practice of earnest, thoroughly evangelical men.

The report goes on to say—"The Society carried on its operations under strict supervision." Some sort of slight supervision was, perhaps, necessary. But why were not the supervisors composed of members of all denominations ? Or why was the farce of a non-sectarian Society kept up ? Why was not the Society made wholly Presbyterian ? Can our pious administrators answer these questions to the satisfaction of the public ?

"The Society rendered an exact account of all its receipts and expenditures." A faithful and correct account at the close of the winter's work was rendered by the employés of the Society, of all meat, &c., distributed by them ; but several of the accounts of tradesmen, who supplied these provisions, as well as those of other creditors of the Society, were never settled.

To continue the criticism of the report. M. le Baron also prosecuted Mr. Campbell, M. Chiniquy, and others, for conspiracy to defame. This is "the vexatious and unjust litigation" referred to in the Assembly's report (page 181) in regard to which Dr. McVicar very naturally dislikes to "enter into further details." But the public should know these details before a penny more be given to the cause of French Presbyterian Evangelization. And what cheap sympathy is curried for M. Chiniquy in the description in the report (page 181) of his arrest in Montreal? This arrest was made by M. LeMétayer, because it was feared that the ex-Priest was about to leave for parts unknown, without being brought at least to the bar of public opinion, to answer for his acts. And for Dr. McVicar to color his report with his graphic description of the scene at family worship, &c., making this arrest one of a series of "sufferings for conscience sake," endured by the celebrated ex-Oblat, is an act only to be reprobated by a truly honest evangelical public opinion.

While on the subject of the Assembly's French Report, let me refer to the narrow sectarian spirit manifested in it. Listen to such truly "scriptural" sentiments as the following, to be found at the top of page 182:—"It is unnecessary and "unwise to attempt to create and foster a French Church, "separated from the great Presbyterian family, to which the "people naturally and historically belong. Ours is the church "which owes so much, under God, to the great and godly "Frenchman, John Calvin, and his pupil, John Knox; and "it possesses, pre-eminently, the elements of doctrine, discipline, and stability, which the people require." (*) And at the foot of page 183, we are told that "they (the Presbyterian public) so feel the importance of evangelizing the "Romanists of this country, that whoever comes as an agent "of French Mission work, whether it be for a Baptist, a

(*) These words are over the signature of a gentleman, (Principal McVicar) who is member of Committee of the French Canadian Missionary Society—well known as a non-sectarian organization.

“ Methodist or an Episcopal Mission, gets the money of our people, most of whom seem to care very little by whom the work is done, provided the French Canadians be evangelized.” Thank God for this spirit ! May it spread with the true spirit of Christianity, till it covers the whole earth !

And then the report adds that the dreadful alternative of sending no agents will be that “ the agents of other churches will receive the contributions of our people.”

The Presbyterian Church, in spite of its many faults and shortcomings, has done a good work in the world. But it does not, by any means, yet contain all the elements of a perfect institution. Let Presbyterians, then, while they hold with a firm hand all that is essentially scriptural in their denomination, strive to purge it of the dross of its unscriptural truths and practices, and especially of its extreme sectarian spirit—a very decided instance of which is to be found in the French Mission Report, which I have the honor to criticise. Did the Apostle Paul (see I. Cor. iii. 3-7)) advocate such views ? Did our Blessed Redeemer preach such a morality ?—(See Mark ix. 38-40.)

To resume the subject of the prosecutions instituted by M. de Guichainville. They never, I may say, met my approval. I did all I could, by letter and private interview with him, to prevent them. Professor Campbell and the Editor of the *Witness* can vouch for the truth of this statement. They both received from me, at the time of the initiation of legal proceedings, notes in which my disapproval was very plainly stated.

I may say that I placed myself in communication, at different times, with members of the Presbytery of Montreal, and of the French Board, for the purpose of acquainting them with the facts bearing upon the administration in Montreal of the Assembly's scheme. Again and again did I remonstrate with members of these bodies, entreating them to do

something, at least, towards stopping the wild career of their administrators of French Evangelization ; but all to no purpose.

Seeing that nothing could be done by complaining to the Presbytery, I decided to send a series of accusations to the Assembly, at its meeting in June 1876. These accusations are contained in the following document, which I have been obliged to modify, for good reasons. Three copies were made by me, and sent to Toronto to three of the most influential members ; but nothing was done by them.

They are prepared under the guise of a letter to a newspaper :—

“ MONTREAL, *June*, 1876.

“ SIR,

“ I cannot express to you the degree of hesitation
 “ with which I take upon myself to disclose to the public the
 “ following facts, in connection with the administration in
 “ Montreal of the French Evangelization scheme of the
 “ Presbyterian Church of Canada.

“ Born and brought up in that Communion, an ex-Sabbath-school Teacher and ex-Deacon of one of its Churches,
 “ my father, for many years, not only an Elder, but a representative Elder of the same Church, my sympathies have
 “ been specially in connection with that branch of Protestant Christendom, and to see it pure and spotless, thoroughly
 “ evangelical in its doctrine, polity and worship, has been
 “ my earnest wish and longing, since I have been led, by
 “ God's grace, to interest myself more particularly in its
 “ welfare. My desire, then, in making the following disclosures, is the good of the Church with which from childhood
 “ I have been connected.

“ I cannot at all see what possible benefit can accrue to
 “ the Church from a policy of reticence as to such acts of its
 “ public men as I shall with unfeigned grief be obliged to
 “ reveal. We read in Ezek. XXXIV, and Jeremiah VIII

“ and XXII, and other places, of fearful denunciations against
 “ unfaithful pastors. Let us beware lest these woes come not
 “ upon the Presbyterian Church on account of its false charity
 “ to the guilty.

“ I would like to preface further these disclosures by a
 “ necessary statement as regards my connection with a gen-
 “ tleman well known in French Protestant circles in Montreal,
 “ and, as my letter will proceed to relate, well known to the
 “ gentlemen who administer the French missionary work of
 “ the Presbyterian Church in Canada. I refer to M. Le
 “ Métayer-Masselin, Baron de Guichainville, a member of the
 “ French nobility, with whom I had very intimate relations
 “ since my introduction to him in October 1875, when I was
 “ obliged to discontinue them on account of the change in M.
 “ LeMétayer’s position towards the Romish clerical party.
 “ M. LeMétayer, though a professed protestant, (*) thought it
 “ well to make a temporary alliance with the clericals, who
 “ have promised to pay his legal expenses in connection with
 “ two suits, one for libel against M. Z. Lefebvre, and another
 “ for conspiracy to defame against Prof. Campbell, Father
 “ Chiniquy, &c. I do not defend the course of M. LeMétayer.
 “ I think it is as morally wrong as it is unwise from a purely
 “ worldly point of view. Still, I cannot do as the gentlemen
 “ of the French Board—throw him overboard altogether. M.
 “ Le Métayer was in the highest favor with these gentlemen
 “ while he was doing all in his power to assist them during
 “ the winter of 1876, by taking a prominent position in con-
 “ nection with St. John’s Church and the French Protestant
 “ Benevolent Society, and, as soon as he showed the slightest
 “ independence, this policy towards him was changed. Hence
 “ the correspondence in the Montreal *Witness*, which pro-
 “ voked the prosecutions above referred to.

(*) M. LeMétayer is more strongly than ever attached to Protestantism since this second experience by him of R. C. clericalism. He has completely and forever severed his connection with Rome, and is now a communicant of Craig Street French Evangelical Church.

“ My criticism of the acts of the French Board will commence with my connection with it as Superintendent of St. John’s French Presbyterian Sunday School.

“ In the fall of 1874, I was requested by Rev. Charles Tanner, then pastor of St. John’s Church, to connect myself with the Sabbath School as teacher. This I did, and remained in that capacity till September 1875, when the teachers unanimously requested me to take the Superintendence. (I say positively that I never sought this position. I only accepted it after being several times pressed to do so by M. Tanner and the teachers.) I consented to act as Director for three or four months—*i. e.*, till the end of the year.

“ I may say, that from the fall of 1874 till that of 1875, the number of scholars had risen from three to thirty, an organ had been hired and another subsequently purchased and paid for, a library collected, a monthly illustrated paper obtained, and all these improvements made without expense to the congregation or French Board. (*)

“ But the arrangement was spoilt by the uncalled for action of the French Board, which took upon itself to interfere in the affairs of a Sunday School attached to an organized Church. (Such has been the position of St. John’s for many years.) The Board decided to introduce certain changes in the School, and as I was alone in opposing this policy, I felt myself obliged to give in my resignation as Superintendent, retaining my position as teacher, which I subsequently also resigned.

“ I now proceed to grave accusations against Prof. Campbell as President of the *Conseil d’Administration*, or Board of Managers of St. John’s Church.

(*) I do not wish to add this note, but the character of my opponents will oblige me to “blow my own horn” to the extent of saying that it was with great difficulty that I was able to introduce these improvements, nearly the whole labor of their introduction devolving upon me.

“ Mr. Campbell stated at a meeting of this Board that the
 “ Board of French Evangelization had decided to request
 “ Father Chiniquy to leave Montreal at once for the Maritime
 “ Provinces, and Prof. Campbell further stated before three
 “ members of the Board of Managers, that if M. Chiniquy
 “ did not leave Montreal as requested by the Board of French
 “ Evangelization, he would be brought before the General
 “ Assembly for his conduct in connection with a well-known
 “ case of Church discipline hereinafter referred to. Such was
 “ the statement of Mr. Campbell to his Managers. Was this
 “ course towards Father Chiniquy adopted? No. Mr. Camp-
 “ bell knows too well that at that time he durst not even
 “ *threaten* to adopt such a policy towards the famous ex-priest.

“ Mr. Campbell stated positively at a meeting of the
 “ Church Managers that Rev. Charles Doudiet would become
 “ pastor of St. John's Church on the 1st April, 1876, and M.
 “ Doudiet made a similar statement to M. LeMétayer-
 “ Masselin, then Secretary of the Board of Managers. The
 “ French Europeans in the Church, who neither respected nor
 “ liked M. Chiniquy, were very much annoyed when a few
 “ days afterwards, as can be proved by the following trans-
 “ lation of an extract from the minutes of the Board of
 “ Managers, this policy was changed, and M. Chiniquy's
 “ connection with the Church continued, not of course as
 “ pastor, but to aid in conducting its services. The extract
 “ is as follows: ‘ Mr. Campbell added that the resignation
 “ ‘ of M. Tanner not having been accepted, there would be
 “ ‘ no difficulty, in his opinion, in continuing the connection
 “ ‘ of M. Chiniquy with the Church in conducting its services.’

“ The following are other promises of Prof. Campbell.

“ Mr. Campbell promised M. LeMétayer the editorship
 “ of the French column of the *Witness*, in a letter to him, in
 “ which occur the words, ‘ the days of M. Mansart (the present
 “ editor) are counted.’

“ Mr. Campbell further promised to erect or purchase a
 “ large establishment for the operations of the French Pro-
 “ testant Benevolent Society, containing offices for M. Le
 “ Métayer as President, and the position of Superintendent
 “ to M. Lambert, one of M. LeMétayer's most devoted sup-
 “ porters.

“ Not one of these promises thus solemnly made has been
 “ carried out.

“ I now come to the case of the connection of Dr.
 “ McVicar and Prof. Campbell, with the French Protestant
 “ Benevolent Society.

“ This Society was founded in January 1871, on a non-
 “ sectarian basis, and consequently supported by contributions
 “ from all denominations, M. LeMétayer, of whom I have
 “ already spoken, being appointed its President, and M. Z.
 “ Lefebvre, Treasurer. I accuse Dr. McVicar and Prof. Camp-
 “ bell, as members of the French Board, of imposing M. Le-
 “ febvre upon the Society its Treasurer, in order to obtain
 “ for them information as to its operations. I also accuse
 “ these gentlemen of employing M. Alfred Blouin, who was
 “ also imposed upon the Society, for the same purpose.

“ I further accuse Dr. McVicar and Prof. Campbell, of
 “ having all through the winter, the intention of interfering
 “ in the management of the French Protestant Benevolent
 “ Society, and then, at the close of the season, of seizing upon
 “ it and making it a completely Presbyterian organization.

“ I come now to an exceedingly grave accusation against
 “ Father Chiniquy, which certainly will not appear in the
 “ report of the French Board, which will be read before the
 “ General Assembly. I allude to the case of a member of St.
 “ John's Church expelled for scandalous conduct. This man
 “ was a member of the Benevolent Society's Committee, and
 “ that Committee, on learning the interesting facts that their
 “ fellow committee-man had been thrice condemned in Canada

“ for larceny, &c., and that he was living in concubinage, (*)
 “ decided to expel him from their Society. A resolution to
 “ that effect was passed at a meeting of the Committee, and
 “ M. J. Cornu and M. LeMétayer-Masselin were appointed a
 “ sub-committee to wait upon Father Chiniquy, and request
 “ him to send away P—— quietly. They found the good
 “ father in his study, and on stating their business, met with
 “ great coldness and distance, M. Chiniquy endeavoring to
 “ dissuade them from their purpose. The conversation lasted
 “ some moments, and then the deputation rose to leave the
 “ house. M. Cornu had arrived at the front door, when M.
 “ Chiniquy seized M. LeMétayer by the arm, and leading him
 “ back to the study, said to him, ‘P—— must remain. You
 “ must retain him. Do you understand?’ M. LeMétayer
 “ indignantly refused to shield the guilty man, and not only
 “ was he expelled from the Society, but he was disciplined by
 “ the Church, or rather expelled by a joint meeting of the
 “ Board and some members of the Church. This piece of
 “ discipline should, of course, have been carried out; but, being
 “ in connection with a member of an organized Church,
 “ should, it appears to me, have been managed by the Church,
 “ and not by the members of an Assembly’s Committee.

“ Such are only a few of the many unrighteous acts of
 “ gentlemen to whom the Presbyterian Church in Canada has
 “ delegated the duties of administrators of its French Evan-
 “ gelization scheme.

“ I leave to an enlightened public to say whether they
 “ should any longer retain the position which they have dis-
 “ honored by such unworthy acts as I have described.

“ I have the honor to remain,

“ Yours, &c.,

“ W. B. COURT.”

(*) I may add that at the time of the investigation into this man’s character, M. LeMétayer was requested by the gentlemen of the French Board to write home to the French Government for information as to his past life. Some time ago, this information was received, and was to the effect that a man named P——, a notorious communist, had been condemned for all sorts of crimes to prison. He had escaped, however. He had been under police *surveillance* since 1870. This is the man whom M. Chiniquy employed in Montreal as his principal evangelist.

The threat of publicity I now carry out.

Before completing this work, I wish to add another accusation against Father Chiniquy.

Early in the spring of 1876, M. Chiniquy, not content with the usual spiritual weapons which he employs for the purpose of overthrowing the power of Rome in this Province, had recourse to the following truly characteristic one, which, I am sure, St. Paul does not recommend in Ephes. VI.

A young Frenchman of the name of Michel George, or Gégéor Melchi, with two other French Europeans, formed themselves into a partnership for the purpose of publishing a journal called *La Liberté*. Before commencing operations, they called upon Father Chiniquy, who highly approved of their undertaking, although he did not then give them any pecuniary aid. After the publication of two numbers, they applied to M. Chiniquy for assistance, and the latter agreed to purchase their press, and became in fact proprietor of the undertaking, but in the name of his nephew, M. Allard, who is a minor, and a student of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, the firm, then reduced to two by the secession of one of the original members, carrying on the work of publication.

It should be noticed that M. George belongs to the extreme free-thinking (and free-practising) school, and still M. Chiniquy did not scruple to carry on a newspaper with the said M. George as editor, and what a newspaper! The republication of such French anti-papal novels as the "Wandering Jew," the "Mysteries of Claude Street," &c., was his principal object.

The publication of this "organ" of Rev. Charles Chiniquy, minister of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, was interrupted by a quarrel between him and M. George, the latter threatening to expose the former to the public if he did not pay him what he wanted. On M. Chiniquy refusing, M. George prepared a pamphlet (this time from a clerical point of view) entitled "*Chiniquy aux Enfers*," (Chiniquy in Hell,)

and had the type for printing it set up on the ex-priest's own press, when M. Chiniquy discovered the act. Only a few copies of this pamphlet were published. *But some are in the hands of the clericals.* This affair caused the suppression of *La Liberté*.

The following are further facts relating to the work of the Board :—

It is well known in Montreal that the effect of the administration of the Board upon the French Europeans, who were at least intellectually converted to Protestantism and relapsed, and upon those who remained nominally in Romanism, was to induce them to lose faith in Protestantism. I have come across personally many families who were nominally converts of M. Chiniquy, but who really had no more reverence for their new than they had for their old faith, but who made use of both for worldly purposes. And nearly all this want of confidence in Protestantism, and what is far sadder, in the Gospel as a divine system of faith and morals, has resulted to a very great extent, as can be very easily proved, from the unfortunate policy of the Board.

I now refer to the case of Canning Street Church, to demonstrate clearly the unreliable character of M. Chiniquy's work there. During last winter, there was an average attendance of about 300 ; on the first of May, the average was about 80. In the day and Sunday Schools, during the winter, the average attendance was about 45 ; on the first of May, it was reduced to about 12. It appears to me that evangelistic work should succeed in spring as well as in winter. Further, M. Chiniquy added to the membership 115 names, "after careful and minute examination of each applicant individually," (as the Board's report says) yet, of these 115, about two-thirds can be proved to be persons quite unfit to take the position of members of Christ's visible Church.

I refer now to the wholesale publication of names of converts. This system cannot be too severely reprobated.

Hundreds of names of persons, well known to the Police and Priests, as persons of the worst character, and who are still so, have been advertised in the *Daily Witness* and *Aurora* as converts to Protestantism. The effect of this unfortunate course has been to make the Presbyterian Mission a laughing-stock with all honest and serious men. Further, I have evidence, furnished by two persons well known for their credibility and knowledge of what they testify to, to prove that of the 400 converts of M. Chiniquy, published in the *Witness* of March last, all are more or less doubtful. Indeed, of the 6000 or 7000 names of those who have been represented in the public prints as converts to the Gospel, perhaps one-twentieth—and this I would consider a high estimate—may be looked upon as even nominal Protestants.

Another fact, or rather deduction from previous facts, will show the sad inconsistency of those whose actions I am criticising. It is well known that these gentlemen represent an extreme section of the Presbyterian Church, and other Churches, who object to religious revivals—at least to those conducted by persons whom they call “unauthorized” teachers—on the ground of the scandals resulting from them from the employment of such improper instruments. Without discussing the wisdom or lack of wisdom of their position, I merely state that my facts clearly demonstrate that when these gentlemen conduct a revival themselves, and employ only “authorized” teachers, such a movement turns out to be one of the greatest religious mistakes which has been committed by any branch of the Church of Christ in Canada; and let me add, that these gentlemen have never, at least as far as I am aware, done anything to disprove my statement. The movement has always been recognized by them as a grand evangelistic work, similar to that of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. For instance, M. Chiniquy puts into the mouths of nearly 250 so-called converts (see *Daily Witness*, 26th March 1876) the words, of which the following is a translation:—“We desire to serve only the true Christ, who has saved us by his

death." He speaks, in the London (Eng.) *Christian*, of the 400 already referred to, "as *new-born* children of the Gospel." Further, Dr. McVicar, in an appeal for aid, (see *Daily Witness*, 16th March 1877,) speaks of the Canning Street converts (400, it may be remembered, have been shown by me to be all more or less doubtful) as showing a great "degree of zeal and earnestness to hear and learn the Word of Life," and it is on account of this pretended zeal that he makes the appeal.

I may say, as a set-off to my other statements, that I have myself met with a few, but a very few, genuine and really earnest Christians among these converts; and several of them have deplored, as strongly as myself, the errors committed by the Board and its employés in carrying on their work.

My task is now concluded. It was commenced not without much fear and trembling. I have stated my case. I ask for a verdict from the jury of the truly intelligent, enlightened, religious Canadian public opinion. I ask for a verdict in accordance with the evidence; and I may say, in this connection, that to every statement I have made, witnesses are ready to testify before any Court, Ecclesiastical, Civil or Criminal. My object in writing is the good of my French fellow-countrymen. May this end be accomplished by the somewhat unusual means employed.

A most thorough and searching enquiry should be made by the Presbyterian General Assembly, into the acts of its administrators of French Evangelization. This I ask. I do not dread the result of an impartial examination. If this investigation be held, and if at its close the guilt of the gentlemen whose acts I have revealed be proved, *and they, in consequence, severely dealt with, (for an example should be made,)* then, to some extent, will public confidence be restored in the good intentions of the Presbyterian Church, in the measures it is adopting for advancing the cause of the Gospel amongst the French Canadians.

